

nicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

¶115.16 PRESIDENT AND MRS. GERALD R. FORD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. THOMAS moved to suspend the rules and agree to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 196):

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on October 27, 1999, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BIGGERT, recognized Mr. THOMAS and Mr. KILDEE, each for 20 minutes.

After debate,

The question being put, viva voce,

Will the House suspend the rules and agree to said concurrent resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BIGGERT, announced that two-thirds of the Members present had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. THOMAS demanded that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays, which demand was supported by one-fifth of the Members present, so the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BIGGERT, pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, announced that further proceedings on the motion were postponed.

¶115.17 RECESS—3:08 P.M.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BIGGERT, pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, declared the House in recess at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m., subject to the call of the Chair.

¶115.18 AFTER RECESS—5 P.M.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, called the House to order.

¶115.19 MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES—H.R. 2670

Mr. COBURN submitted the privileged motion to instruct the managers on the part of the House at the conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, to agree, to the extent within the scope of the conference, to provisions that (1) reduce nonessential spending in programs within the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and other related agencies; (2) reduce spending on international organizations, in particular, in order to honor the commitment of the Congress to protect Social Security; and (3) do not increase overall spending to a level that exceeds the higher of the House bill or the Senate amendment.

After debate,

By unanimous consent, the previous question was ordered on the motion to

instruct the managers on the part of the House.

The question being put, viva voce,

Will the House agree to said motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, announced that the nays had it.

Mr. COBURN objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and not voting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, announced that further proceedings on the motion were postponed until Tuesday, October 19, 1999.

The point of no quorum was considered as withdrawn.

¶115.20 MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, laid before the House a message from the President, which was read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 307(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5877(c)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which covers activities that occurred in fiscal year 1998.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 1999.

By unanimous consent, the message, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

¶115.21 MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—VETO OF H.R. 2606

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, laid before the House a message from the President, which was read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2606, the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000."

The central lesson we have learned in this century is that we cannot protect American interests at home without active engagement abroad. Common sense tells us, and hard experience has confirmed, that we must lead in the world, working with other nations to defuse crises, repel dangers, promote more open economic and political systems, and strengthen the rule of law. These have been the guiding principles of American foreign policy for generations. They have served the American people well, and greatly helped to advance the cause of peace and freedom around the world.

This bill rejects all of those principles. It puts at risk America's 50-year tradition of leadership for a safer, more prosperous and democratic world. It is an abandonment of hope in our Nation's capacity to shape that kind of world. It implies that we are too small and insecure to meet our share of international responsibilities, too shortsighted to see that doing so is in our national interest. It is another sign of a new isolationism that would have

America bury its head in the sand at the height of our power and prosperity.

In the short term, H.R. 2606 fails to address critical national security needs. It suggests we can afford to underfund our efforts to keep deadly weapons from falling into dangerous hands and walk away without peril from our essential work toward peace in places of conflict. Just as seriously, it fails to address America's long-term interests. It reduces assistance to nations struggling to build democratic societies and open markets and backs away from our commitment to help people trapped in poverty to stand on their feet. This, too, threatens our security because future threats will come from regions and nations where instability and misery prevail and future opportunities will come from nations on the road to freedom and growth.

By denying America a decent investment in diplomacy, this bill suggests we should meet threats to our security with our military might alone. That is a dangerous proposition. For if we underfund our diplomacy, we will end up overusing our military. Problems we might have been able to resolve peacefully will turn into crises we can only resolve at a cost of life and treasure. Shortchanging our arsenal of peace is as risky as shortchanging our arsenal of war.

The overall funding provided by H.R. 2606 is inadequate. It is about half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan in 1985, and it is 14 percent below the level that I requested. I proposed to fund this higher level within the budget limits and without spending any of the Social Security surplus. The specific shortfalls in the current bill are numerous and unacceptable.

For example, it is shocking that the Congress has failed to fulfill our obligations to Israel and its neighbors as they take risks and make difficult decisions to advance the Middle East peace process. My Administration, like all its predecessors, has fought hard to promote peace in the Middle East. This bill would provide neither the \$800 million requested this year as a supplemental appropriation nor the \$500 million requested in FY 2000 funding to support the Wye River Agreement. Just when Prime Minister Barak has helped give the peace process a jump start, this sends the worst possible message to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians about America's commitment to the peace process. We should instead seize this opportunity to support them.

Additional resources are required to respond to the costs of building peace in Kosovo and the rest of the Balkans, and I intend to work with the Congress to provide needed assistance. Other life-saving peace efforts, such as those in Sierra Leone and East Timor, are imperiled by the bill's inadequate funding of the voluntary peacekeeping account.

My Administration has sought to protect Americans from the threat posed by the potential danger of weap-

ons proliferation from Russia and the countries of the former Soviet Union. But the Congress has failed to finance the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI), which is designed to prevent weapons of mass destruction and weapons technologies from falling into the wrong hands and weapons scientists from offering their talents to countries, or even terrorists, seeking these weapons. The bill also curtails ETRI programs that help Russia and other New Independent States strengthen export controls to avoid illicit trafficking in sensitive materials through their borders and airports. The ETRI will also help facilitate withdrawal of Russian forces and equipment from countries such as Georgia and Moldova; it will create peaceful research opportunities for thousands of former Soviet weapons scientists. We also cannot afford to underfund programs that support democracy and small scale enterprises in Russia and other New Independent States because these are the very kinds of initiatives needed to complete their transformation away from communism and authoritarianism.

A generation from now, no one is going to say we did too much to help the nations of the former Soviet Union safeguard their nuclear technology and expertise. If the funding cuts in this bill were to become law, future generations would certainly say we did too little and that we imperiled our future in the process.

My Administration has also sought to promote economic progress and political change in developing countries, because America benefits when these countries become our partners in security and trade. At the Cologne Summit, we led a historic effort to enable the world's poorest and most heavily indebted countries to finance health, education, and opportunity programs. The Congress fails to fund the U.S. contribution. The bill also severely underfunds Multilateral Development Banks, providing the lowest level of financing since 1987, with cuts of 37 percent from our request. This will virtually double U.S. arrears to these banks and seriously undermine our capacity to promote economic reform and growth in Latin America, Asia, and especially Africa. These markets are critical to American jobs and opportunities.

Across the board, my Administration requested the funding necessary to assure American leadership on matters vital to the interests and values of our citizens. In area after area, from fighting terrorism and international crime to promoting nuclear stability on the Korean peninsula, from helping refugees and disaster victims to meetings its own goal of a 10,000-member Peace Corps, the Congress has failed to fund adequately these requests.

Several policy matters addressed in the bill are also problematic. One provision would hamper the Export-Import Bank's ability to be responsive to American exporters by requiring that

the Congress be notified of dozens of additional kinds of transactions before the Bank can offer financing. Another provision would allow the Export-Import Bank to operate without a quorum until March 2000. I have nominated two individuals to the Bank's Board, and they should be confirmed.

A third provision could be read to prevent the United States from engaging in diplomatic efforts to promote a cost-effective, global solution to climate change. A fourth provision places restrictions on assistance to Indonesia that could harm our ability to influence the objectives we share with the Congress: ensuring that Indonesia honors the referendum in East Timor and that security is restored there, while encouraging democracy and economic reform in Indonesia. Finally, this bill contains several sections that, if treated as mandatory, would encroach on the President's sole constitutional authority to conduct diplomatic negotiations.

In sum, this appropriations bill undermines important American interests and ignores the lessons that have been at the core of our bipartisan foreign policy for the last half century. Like the Senate's recent vote to defeat the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, this bill reflects an inexcusable and potentially dangerous complacency about the opportunities and risks America faces in the world today. I therefore am returning this bill without my approval.

I look forward to working with the Congress to craft an appropriations bill that I can support, one that maintains our commitment to protecting the Social Security surplus, properly addressing our shared goal of an America that is strong at home and strong abroad, respected not only for our leadership, but for the vision and commitment that real leadership entails. The American people deserve a foreign policy worthy of our great country, and I will fight to ensure that they continue to have one.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1999.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, by unanimous consent, ordered that the veto message, together with the accompanying bill, be printed (H. Doc. 106-145) and spread upon the pages of the Journal of the House.

Mr. CALLAHAN moved that the veto message and accompanying bill were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

After debate,

The question being put, *viva voce*,

Will the house agree to said motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, announced that the yeas had it. So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby said motion was agreed to was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

¶115.22 FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, an-

nounced that the Senate had passed an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3064. An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3064) "An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KYL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. INOUE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

¶115.23 UNFINISHED BUSINESS— APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, announced the unfinished business to be the question on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal of Thursday, October 14, 1999.

The question being put, *viva voce*,

Will the House agree to the Chair's approval of said Journal?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. GIBBONS, announced that the yeas had it.

Mr. ISTOOK demanded that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays, which demand was supported by one-fifth of the Members present, so the yeas and nays were ordered.

It was decided in the affirmative	Yeas	357
	Nays	49
	Answered present	1

¶115.24 [Roll No. 505] YEAS—357

Abercrombie	Boehner	Cubin
Ackerman	Bonilla	Cummings
Aderholt	Bonior	Cunningham
Allen	Bono	Danner
Andrews	Boswell	Davis (FL)
Archer	Boucher	Davis (IL)
Armey	Boyd	Davis (VA)
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Deal
Baker	Brown (OH)	DeGette
Baldacci	Bryant	Delahunt
Baldwin	Burr	DeLauro
Ballenger	Burton	DeLay
Barcia	Callahan	DeMint
Barr	Calvert	Deutsch
Barrett (NE)	Campbell	Diaz-Balart
Barrett (WI)	Canady	Dicks
Bartlett	Cannon	Dingell
Barton	Capps	Dixon
Bass	Capuano	Doggett
Bateman	Cardin	Dooley
Becerra	Castle	Doolittle
Bentsen	Chabot	Doyle
Bereuter	Chambliss	Dreier
Berkley	Chenoweth-Hage	Duncan
Berman	Clayton	Dunn
Berry	Clement	Edwards
Biggart	Coble	Ehlers
Bilbray	Combest	Ehrlich
Bilirakis	Condit	Emerson
Bishop	Conyers	Engel
Blagojevich	Cook	Eshoo
Bliley	Cox	Etheridge
Blumenauer	Coyne	Everett
Blunt	Cramer	Ewing
Boehlert	Crowley	Fletcher